10TH EAST AFRICA PHILANTHROPY CONFERENCE
Workstream 3 | Domestic Capital and Giving Architecture

From Giving to Stewardship:

Governance, Fiduciary Infrastructure, and the Architecture of Long-Term Philanthropy in East Africa

Gloria Kambedha | Greenthos Capital

June 2026

ABSTRACT

Across East Africa, philanthropic capital is growing in scale, sophistication, and ambition. High-net-worth individuals, diaspora families, and institution builders are increasingly seeking structures that extend beyond charitable activity toward lasting stewardship. Yet the architecture that would make this possible (governance frameworks, fiduciary vehicles, endowment design, and succession planning) remains underdeveloped relative to the capital available.

This paper argues that the central challenge facing East African philanthropy is not the absence of generosity. It is the absence of governance. Drawing on fiduciary practice and regional stewardship realities, the paper examines the structural tensions embedded within long-term giving, the design principles for effective stewardship vehicles, and the frameworks that enable practitioners to engage private wealth with institutional discipline. It introduces two practitioner tools: a Giving Readiness Assessment and a Governance Checklist for trust-based engagement with high-net-worth individuals.

1. Introduction

Across East Africa, a structural shift in philanthropic capital is underway. Remittance inflows to Africa reached $96 billion in 2024, surpassing official development assistance and foreign direct investment for the second consecutive decade. High-net-worth individuals across the continent are accumulating wealth at historic rates and expressing growing interest in structured giving, legacy philanthropy, and endowment vehicles. Mobile money has penetrated communities that formal banking never reached, creating payment rails capable of carrying philanthropic capital at scale. Faith-based systems move billions annually through channels that operate entirely outside formal philanthropic infrastructure.

The capital is present, substantial, and growing. What is absent is the architecture.

Philanthropic practitioners, legal advisors, and family wealth managers across the region are increasingly encountering the same inflection point: a generous, wealthy individual or family with a clear desire to give strategically, but no governance structure to make that giving sustainable. The vehicle question is unavoidable: when a wealthy East African individual wants to give in a way that outlasts them, what structure do they use? Who governs it? How is capital deployed? How is continuity preserved?

This paper addresses that question directly. It is grounded in fiduciary practice and is written for philanthropic practitioners, legal and financial advisors, and institution builders working at the intersection of private wealth and public purpose in East Africa. It does not argue that more capital is needed. It argues that better architecture is.

At what point does generosity require governance?

That question frames everything that follows. The answer, explored across the sections below, is: sooner than most donors expect, and in ways that require deliberate structural design rather than informal intent.

---

2. Two Orientations: Transactional Giving and Fiduciary Stewardship

Much philanthropic activity in East Africa remains personality-dependent. Capital moves according to urgency, emotion, individual preference, or immediate social pressure. A founder gives generously throughout their lifetime. Relationships are sustained, communities supported, causes advanced. But when the founder exits, through death, illness, or shifting priorities, giving ceases, structures collapse, and the impact accumulated over decades proves fragile.

This is not a failure of generosity. It is a failure of governance architecture.

Fiduciary stewardship introduces a fundamentally different orientation. Rather than asking how much to give and to whom, it asks what survives the founder: who governs the capital, according to what rules, under what constraints, and for whose long-term benefit. The philanthropic structure becomes not merely a pool of capital but a system for making decisions across time.

Transactional Giving	Fiduciary Stewardship
Emotional	Policy-based
Reactive	Structured
Short-term	Intergenerational
Personality-dependent	Governance-dependent
Distribution-focused	Sustainability-focused

The distinction matters practically. Philanthropic continuity rarely fails because generosity declines. It fails because governance architecture was never established. The founder's intention was clear; the structure for carrying that intention beyond the founder was not.

The transition from the left column to the right is the practitioner's central challenge. It requires not persuading a donor to give more, but persuading a donor that their generosity deserves a structure equal to its ambition.

3. Designing the Stewardship Vehicle

When philanthropic capital becomes intergenerational, governance questions become unavoidable. The central challenge shifts from how much should be given to how decisions about capital should continue responsibly over time.

A well-designed stewardship vehicle clarifies five foundational questions before any legal structure is formed: Who decides? According to what rules? Under what constraints? For whose benefit? How is continuity preserved? The answers to these questions, not the legal form chosen, determine whether a philanthropic structure survives beyond its founder.

Layer	Core Question
Purpose	Why does this vehicle exist?
Governance	Who decides, and what authority do they hold?
Distribution	How is capital deployed, and according to what logic?
Sustainability	How is continuity preserved across leadership transitions?
Accountability	How is trust maintained between trustees and beneficiaries?
Succession	What survives the founder?

3.1 Decision Rights

Most philanthropic failures are failures of unclear authority. Governance begins with the explicit allocation of decision-making power across three categories of actor: the founder, the trustees, and the beneficiaries.

Founders frequently retain informal control long after legal governance has been established. The structural question is whether founder authority is formally documented, whether it is transferable, and whether it diminishes over time according to a defined process. Trustees may be administrative, executing defined instructions, or they may exercise discretionary judgment across a wide range of circumstances. Both models are legitimate; the distinction must be made explicit. Beneficiary participation ranges from pure receipt of distributions to formal representation on advisory committees. The appropriate model depends on the purpose of the vehicle, the maturity of the beneficiaries, and the governance philosophy of the founder.

Governance should clarify, in documented form, who may recommend, who may approve, who may veto, and who bears fiduciary responsibility for each category of decision.

3.2 Distribution Logic

How capital is deployed over time is the most consequential operational decision a stewardship vehicle makes. Three models exist, each with distinct strengths and failure modes.

Rules-Based	Discretionary	Hybrid
Fixed percentage payouts, defined eligibility criteria, objective distribution triggers. Strength: predictability and governance consistency. Risk: rigidity in the face of changed circumstances.	Trustees exercise case-by-case judgment across a wide range of circumstances. Strength: contextual flexibility. Risk: inconsistency, perceived unfairness, politicisation.	Rules-based distributions for defined categories; discretionary review for exceptional cases. Strength: balances predictability with responsiveness. In most contexts, this is the appropriate model.

> ***Is the vehicle designed to distribute capital, or to distribute opportunity?***

That question should be posed to every philanthropic founder before a distribution policy is finalised. A vehicle that distributes capital depletes itself toward an outcome. A vehicle that distributes opportunity preserves the conditions under which beneficiaries can build their own capacity. The answer is a values question, not a technical one, and it determines everything about how the distribution policy is designed.

3.3 Sustainability Thresholds

A stewardship vehicle fails not only when capital disappears but also when governance costs exceed stewardship value. Sustainability requires deliberate policy design across five dimensions: capital preservation discipline (whether the real value of principal must be maintained or may be consumed), a spending rule (fixed percentage, rolling average, or discretionary bands), liquidity thresholds (minimum reserve ratios and emergency suspension triggers), investment governance (who sets investment policy and what risk tolerance applies), and administrative sustainability (who holds the structure together operationally and at what cost).

These are not technical afterthoughts. They are governance decisions that should be made at the formation stage and documented as formal policy. A structure that has not answered these questions is not yet a stewardship vehicle. It is a pool of capital with good intentions.

4. Case Illustration: The Discretionary Trust as a Philanthropic Vehicle

NOTE ON CONFIDENTIALITY

The following illustration draws on fiduciary practice. All identifying details have been anonymised. The structural tensions and governance logic described are real; the client is composite.

A high-net-worth individual approached our practice with a set of objectives that are, in our experience, increasingly common among East African wealth holders of the first generation: to support descendants financially, to preserve family values across generations, to avoid creating entitlement or psychological dependency, and to establish philanthropic continuity that would survive their own exit.

The intentions were clear. The structure was not.

Four governance tensions surfaced immediately in the structuring conversation, each of which required explicit resolution before any legal vehicle could be designed.

Governance Tension	The Structural Question It Raised
Control vs. governance	Should the founder retain veto authority over trustee decisions, and if so, for how long? What mechanism transfers authority at the appropriate moment?
Automatic vs. discretionary distributions	Should beneficiaries receive fixed entitlements, or should distributions require trustee approval? The former creates predictability; the latter risks perceived unfairness.
Capital preservation vs. present impact	What proportion of capital should be deployed in the near term versus preserved for future beneficiaries? This is a

	values question that governance must accommodate but cannot resolve.
Responsibility without dependency	How should the structure be designed to reinforce beneficiary initiative rather than replace it? What conditions, if any, should attach to distributions?

The resolution in each case was reached through fiduciary logic rather than family sentiment. A discretionary trust was structured with a hybrid distribution model: a defined set of purpose-linked distributions (education, healthcare, entrepreneurial support) governed by clear eligibility principles, and a discretionary reserve available to trustees for exceptional circumstances. Trustee authority was documented explicitly, with founder influence held as a formal advisory role rather than a veto. A sustainability threshold was established requiring the trust to maintain capital sufficient to sustain defined distributions for a minimum of fifteen years before any exceptional discretionary payment could be made.

The structure embedded the founder's values. It did not depend on the founder's ongoing presence to carry them.

5. Responsibility Without Dependency

One of the deepest tensions in philanthropic stewardship, particularly in family-linked structures, is how to support beneficiaries without unintentionally weakening initiative, dignity, or responsibility. Wealth structured for long-term giving operates in a social environment where support, obligation, inheritance, and emotional expectation frequently overlap. The stewardship vehicle must navigate this terrain deliberately.

Three design principles are consistently relevant.

Purpose-Linked Distributions

Capital is made available for clearly defined purposes (education, healthcare, entrepreneurship, developmental support) rather than as automatic entitlement. The objective is aligned support, not unconditional transfer. The beneficiary demonstrates need or alignment with the stated purpose; the structure does not require mere existence as its eligibility criterion.

Earned Access

Some structures require beneficiaries to demonstrate initiative, participation, or alignment before accessing certain categories of support. This design principle is not punitive. It is developmental. The structure seeks to partner with agency rather than replace it. In practice, this may mean matching contributions, requiring participation in defined programmes, or conditioning access on demonstrated engagement with the vehicle's stated purpose.

Transparent Governance

Beneficiaries should understand the rules governing distributions, the identity and role of trustees, the principles that guide decisions, and the process by which exceptional cases are reviewed. Opacity creates resentment. Clarity creates dignity. In family-linked structures, governance transparency is also a practical mechanism for conflict prevention: when the rules are known and understood, disputes about individual decisions become less likely and more easily resolved.

---

6. Why Philanthropic Structures Fail

Many philanthropic structures fail not because capital disappears but because governance cannot survive relational pressure. Understanding the common failure modes is as important as understanding good design, because most structures in the East African context are founded with genuine intent and collapse not through dishonesty but through governance gaps that were never addressed at formation.

Failure Mode	What It Looks Like in Practice
Founder-centric control	All meaningful decisions flow through the founder. When the founder exits, the structure has no decision-making capacity of its own.
Undefined trustee authority	Trustees are appointed but their powers are not documented. In the absence of explicit authority, informal influence fills the vacuum, usually that of the most vocal family member.
Automatic entitlement distributions	Distributions are made to beneficiaries without conditions or oversight. Over time, the structure becomes an entitlement mechanism rather than a stewardship vehicle.
No spending discipline	The vehicle lacks a formal spending policy. Capital is consumed faster than returns are generated. The structure depletes without a defined mechanism for replenishment or suspension.
Emotional overrides of policy	Governance policy is overridden by family pressure in exceptional cases. Once overridden, the precedent weakens policy for all subsequent decisions.

Governance costs exceeding utility	Administrative costs (legal, accounting, trustee fees) consume a disproportionate share of distributions. The structure becomes financially irrational relative to simpler alternatives.
No succession mechanism	The founding trustees age or disengage with no defined process for selecting successors. Governance continuity depends on individuals rather than institutional process.
Lack of beneficiary clarity	The eligible beneficiary class is not defined precisely. As the family grows or circumstances change, disputes about eligibility destabilise governance.

The pattern across these failure modes is consistent: each represents a governance decision that was deferred at formation in favour of social harmony or speed. The formation moment is the practitioner's most important intervention point. A structure that addresses these questions at formation is significantly more likely to sustain continuity beyond the founder generation.

7. The Corporate Endowment: Fiduciary Discipline Beyond Private Wealth

The governance principles discussed above are not confined to private philanthropic structures. Corporate entities across East Africa are increasingly establishing institutional giving vehicles (foundations, endowment funds, and social investment arms) that face structurally identical challenges: Who governs the capital? According to what mandate? How is the vehicle insulated from the commercial pressures of the parent entity? How is its purpose preserved through leadership transitions?

The endowment model, when applied to corporate philanthropy, provides a specific form of answer. A corporate endowment separates philanthropic capital from operational capital, establishing independent governance and a defined investment mandate that sustains the giving programme regardless of the parent entity's short-term commercial performance. The vehicle becomes institutionally credible in a way that a line item in the annual budget never can.

The stewardship principles that apply to private philanthropic trusts (explicit decision rights, defined distribution logic, sustainability thresholds, succession mechanisms) apply with equal force to corporate endowments. The difference is that in the corporate context, accountability runs not only to beneficiaries but to shareholders, regulators, and the public. This makes governance documentation even more important, and governance lapses even more visible.

For practitioners working with corporate clients seeking to establish institutional giving capacity, the endowment model represents a credible alternative to ad hoc programme-based philanthropy, provided the governance framework is designed with the same rigour applied to private structures.

8. Practitioner Frameworks

The two frameworks below are designed for use in client-facing practice. They are not theoretical instruments. They are diagnostic tools intended to structure the conversation that must happen before any philanthropic vehicle is recommended.

Framework 1: From Giving to Stewardship: A Practitioner Assessment Tool

Use this framework in conversation with a prospective high-net-worth donor before recommending any philanthropic structure. Its purpose is to determine whether the donor is ready for institutional governance, and if so, what form of vehicle is appropriate.

Part One: Giving Readiness	Questions to ask, and what the answers reveal
Have you been giving consistently long enough to know what you care about most?	Someone still exploring causes needs a different conversation than someone with a clear, tested philanthropic commitment. The vehicle question is premature if the mission question is unresolved.
Do you want your giving to continue after you are gone, or is this about impact in your lifetime?	This single question determines whether an endowment makes sense at all. Donors whose ambition ends with their own lifetime need a spend-down logic, not a perpetual vehicle.
How much are you currently giving annually, and is that amount likely to grow?	This determines whether a separate governance vehicle is justified or whether giving sits more naturally within an existing family or corporate structure.
Are you comfortable with a governed process that makes decisions according to rules you set?	Donors who need direct control over every individual decision are not ready for institutional governance. Structure them differently, or return to this conversation when their comfort with governed process has developed.

Part Two: Structure Selection	When to recommend each form

Endow	The cause is clear and long-term. The donor accepts governed decision-making. Capital is sufficient to generate meaningful returns. The donor wants the giving to outlast them.
Spend Down	The cause has urgent present need. The donor wants to see impact directly. Capital is not large enough to sustain meaningful perpetual giving.
Pool	Individual capital cannot achieve the intended impact. Collective action serves the cause better. The donor wants shared governance without the administrative burden of a standalone structure.

Part Three: Tensions to Name Honestly	What each tension requires from governance
Donor intent vs. future reality	What matters to the donor today may not be what the community needs in twenty years. Governance must accommodate values evolution without losing foundational purpose.
Family dynamics vs. institutional discipline	A philanthropic mandate embedded in a family structure must survive relationship changes, generational transitions, and the moments when family feeling and fiduciary duty do not align. Governance cannot prevent these tensions; it can define how they are managed.
Impact vs. preservation	An endowment that protects capital maximally may generate insufficient returns for meaningful activity. A spend-down that maximises present impact leaves nothing for the future. This is a values question. Governance accommodates it but cannot resolve it. The answer must come from the donor.

Part Four: Responsibility Without Dependency	Design principles
Purpose-linked distributions	Capital is available for specific purposes (education, healthcare, entrepreneurship), not automatic entitlement. The beneficiary demonstrates need or alignment, not simply existence.

Earned access	Some structures require beneficiaries to demonstrate initiative before accessing capital. Not punitive, but developmental. The structure partners with initiative rather than replacing it.
Transparent governance	Beneficiaries understand the rules, who decides, and why. Opacity creates resentment. Clarity creates dignity.

Framework 2: Governance Checklist for Trust-Based Engagement with Private Wealth

Use this checklist at the formation stage and at each significant governance review. Its purpose is to ensure that foundational governance questions have been answered explicitly and documented formally before a vehicle is declared operational.

Governance Domain	Questions the structure must answer
Mission and Purpose	Is the mission clearly defined? Is it broad enough to adapt over time without losing foundational purpose? Is it narrow enough to provide genuine decision-making guidance?
Authority and Fiduciary Oversight	Are decision rights documented explicitly across founder, trustee, and beneficiary roles? Are fiduciary duties formally recorded? Are reporting obligations defined? Who reviews outcomes and at what frequency?
Distribution Policy	Are distributions rules-based, discretionary, or hybrid? Are eligibility principles clear and documented? Is the distribution policy reviewed at defined intervals?
Sustainability Policy	Is there a formal spending policy? Is capital preservation defined? Must real value be maintained, or may principal be consumed? Does the structure reinforce beneficiary agency or risk replacing it?
Continuity and Succession	What happens when founders die, disengage, or lose capacity? How are future trustees identified, assessed, and appointed? Is trustee succession a defined process or an informal expectation?

Accountability to Beneficiaries	Do beneficiaries understand the governance structure? Are there defined channels for beneficiary input? How are disputes between trustees and beneficiaries managed?

9. Closing Reflection

The philanthropic ecosystem in East Africa is at an inflection point. Capital is accumulating at historic rates. Diaspora remittances are embedding themselves as a permanent feature of regional finance. High-net-worth individuals are asking questions about legacy, continuity, and structured giving that were not asked, or not asked at this scale, a generation ago. Faith-based systems and community finance mechanisms are demonstrating that philanthropic intent already exists at every level of the income distribution.

What is missing is not generosity. What is missing is architecture.

The governance frameworks introduced in this paper (the stewardship vehicle design layers, the Giving Readiness Assessment, the Governance Checklist) are not ends in themselves. They are starting points for a practitioner conversation that has, for too long, been deferred in favour of the more comfortable conversation about giving amounts and giving targets.

The structural gap is closable. The tools exist. The capital is present. What is required now is the practitioner courage to tell generous people that their generosity deserves a structure equal to its ambition, and the institutional will to build that structure well.

> ***The real stewardship question is not whether wealth can survive generations. It is whether judgment, responsibility, and institutional trust can survive alongside it.***

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gloria Kambedha is a fiduciary practitioner at Greenthos Capital, where she specialises in the design and administration of discretionary trusts, endowment vehicles, and governance frameworks for high-net-worth individuals and institutional clients across East Africa. This paper was presented at the 10th East Africa Philanthropy Conference, Workstream 3, June 2026.

For enquiries: Greenthos Capital | www.greenthos.com